

REMARKS

In this response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Claims 15 and 16 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, 7, and 17 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Accordingly, Claims 1-14 and 17-23 are pending in the application.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant notes Examiner's withdrawal from consideration of Claims 15 and 16.

Information Disclosure Statement

Regarding the IDS submitted on 12/13/2007 by Applicant, Examiner notes that no foreign documents or non-patent literature were submitted in conjunction therewith. Applicant submits herewith such documents, and requests consideration thereof by Examiner.

Claim Amendments

Applicant has amended Claims 1, 2, 7, and 17 to include "an image sensor and a separate display, wherein said image sensor is configured to operate independently of a display device to which said separate display is coupled," (emphasis added) or similar elements. Support for these amendments may be found at least at page 10, lines 13-28, and Figs. 9 and 10 of the specification.

Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the Examiner must show that the cited references, combined, teach or suggest each of the elements of a claim. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Further, the combination of

elements must be more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions. See KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

Claims 1-9, 13(1), 13(2), and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,781,623 issued to Thomas (hereinafter “Thomas”) in view of US 7,289,102 issued to Hinckley (hereinafter “Hinckley”). Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Claim 1, as amended, includes “an image sensor and a separate display, wherein said image sensor is configured to operate independently of a display device to which said separate display is coupled,” (emphasis added). Examiner has not relied upon and Applicant has not been able to discern any part of Thomas or Hinckley that teaches or suggests the above limitations. Thus, Thomas in view of Hinckley does not teach or suggest each of the elements of the claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Independent **Claims 2 and 7**, as amended, include elements similar to those of amended Claim 1. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to independent Claim 1, Thomas in view of Hinckley does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these claims are requested.

Claims 3-9, 13(1), 13(2), and 14 depend from independent Claims 1, 2, and 7, respectively, and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claims, Thomas in view of Hinckley does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these claims are requested.

Claims 17, 19, 20, 22, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hinckley in view of Thomas. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Claim 17, as amended, includes “wherein said image sensor is configured to operate independently of a display device to which said display is coupled.” Examiner has not relied upon and Applicant has not been able to discern any part of Hinckley or Thomas that teaches or suggests the above limitations. Thus, Hinckley in view of Thomas does not teach or suggest each of the elements of the claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claims 19, 20, 22, and 23 depend from independent Claim 17 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, Hinckley in view of Thomas does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these claims are requested.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thomas in view of Hinckley and U.S. Patent No. 6,597,384 issued to Harrison (hereinafter “Harrison”). Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Claim 10 depends from independent Claim 7 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, and because Examiner has not relied upon and Applicant has not been able to discern any part of Harrison that cures the deficiencies of Thomas and Hinckley, Thomas in view of Hinckley and Harrison does not teach or suggest each of the elements of this claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claims 11(1), 11(2), and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thomas in view of Hinckley, U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2005/0007477 by Ahisha (hereinafter “Ahisha”), and U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/013093 by Riconda (hereinafter “Riconda”). Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Claims 11(1), 11(2), and 12 depend from independent Claims 1, 2, and 7, respectively, and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claims, and because Examiner has not relied upon and Applicant has not been able to discern any part of Ahisha or Riconda that cures the deficiencies of Thomas and Hinckley, Thomas in view of Hinckley, Ahisha, and Riconda does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these claims are requested.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hinckley in view of Thomas and Harrison. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

Claim 18 depends from independent Claim 17 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, and because Examiner has not relied upon and Applicant has not been able to discern any part of Harrison that cures the deficiencies of Hinckley and Thomas, Hinckley in view of Thomas and Harrison does not teach or suggest each of the elements of this claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hinckley in view of Thomas, Ahisha, and Riconda. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.


Claim 21 depends from independent Claim 17 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to the independent claim, and because Examiner has not relied upon and Applicant has not been able to discern any part of Ahisha or Riconda that cures the deficiencies of Hinckley and Thomas, Hinckley in view of Thomas, Ahisha, and Riconda does not teach or suggest each of the elements of this claim. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of this claim are requested.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application; the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees to process this Amendment, or credit any over-payments that may apply, to our Deposit Account No. 50-2421.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 19, 2008



David R. Stevens
Reg. No. 38,626

Stevens Law Group
1754 Technology Dr., Ste. 226
San Jose, CA 95110
Tel (408) 288-7588
Fax (408) 288-7542